



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/595,574 | 04/27/2006 | Inghoo Huh | 2050-02 | 2921 |
| 52706 | 7590 | 07/21/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| IPLA P.A. 3580 WILSHIRE BLVD. 17TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90010 | | | CHANG, EDWARD | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3692 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/21/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/595,574 | HUH, INGHOO | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | EDWARD CHANG | 3692 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 April 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/27/2006</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the application filed on 27th of April 2006.
2. Claims 1-14 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims **1~14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "...*the common account*..." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
6. Claims 3, 6, 7, and 12 have the limitation ...*and/or*... which is vague and indefinite because it is not clear how the claim is bounded. Please change the wording of the claim.
7. Claim 9 recites the limitation "...*the account classification codes*..." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Examiner's Note: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

10. Claims 1, 3~7, and 9~14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Blagg et al. (hereinafter "Blagg"); (US 2006/0036543 A1) in view of Dilip et al. (hereinafter "Dilip"); (US 2007/0136169 A1).

As per Claim 1:

Blagg as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *linked account translator connected to the main computer system above, (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)*
- *saving and managing primary account and linked secondary account information, and (See at least Page 1, Paragraph 0009+)*
- *also connected to above main computer system having the common account created by the main computer system as an account for intermediate process on transactions between the said accounts. (See at least Page 1, Paragraph 0003+)*

However, Blagg specifically does not teach the following limitation. But Dilip discloses the following limitations:

- *main computer system in charge of transaction on account holder's account; (See at least Fig. 2, Item 138)*
- *account database which save and manage by the said main computer system connected to the main computer system; (See at least Page 3, Paragraph 0043+)*
- *payment gateway managing transaction in between main computer system and within the externals connected by above main computer system; (See at least Fig. 19, Item 652)*
- *connection hub equipped with external network which control transaction information between external transaction equipments and the main computer system(700) linked to above main computer system; (See at least Page 3, Paragraph 0037+, The market information service server)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Blagg's method of creating linked accounts as taught by Dilip's method/apparatus for implementing financial transaction to have an arrangement of networks and hardwares to establish this. This will greatly increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of the system.

As per Claim 3:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *the said common account is an account created by the main computer system for intermediate account on transactions via the said external network connection hub, account transaction on account database, inter-account transactions between the said account translator and linked accounts and/or via payment gateway, (See at least Page 1, Paragraph 0003+)*
- *may save all transaction details of main computer system, and from the common account which transaction details are all saved allow transfer to outer merchant accounts respectively. (See at least Page 2, Paragraph 0017+)*

As per Claim 4:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein a database to save account information on the primary account and one or more linked secondary accounts is connected to the said linked account translator, and the said common account is accessed to the main computer system. (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)*

As per Claim 5:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *the said linked account translator manages account information on the said primary account and least one of linked secondary accounts; common account*
(See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)

- *saves the details of transactions at main computer system; the said main computer system manages transactions to merchant accounts referring to the transaction details in the said common account.* (See at least Page 2, Paragraph 0017+)

As per Claim 6:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the said linked account translator and/or common account is comprised in the said main computer system; and/or as a computer system separated from the main computer system* (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)

As per Claim 7:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the account information on primary account and one or more linked secondary accounts managed by the above linked account translator are saved and managed at the existing account database,* (See at least Page 2, Paragraph 0017+)
- *for the case of the said linked account translator and/or common account is equipped inside of the said main computer system* (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)

As per Claim 9:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the said primary account and one or more of the said linked secondary accounts are managed by the said linked account translator by the individual account numbers with the account classification codes issued by the bank (See at least Page 7, Paragraph 0075+)*

As per Claim 10:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein the primary account and one or more linked secondary accounts are managed by the said linked account translator, and (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)*
- *one or more linked secondary accounts are allocated as other person's account according to the designation by the primary account holder. (See at least Page 1, Paragraph 0011+)*

However, Blagg specifically does not teach the following limitation. But Dilip discloses the following limitations:

- *the said primary account is processed to transact approved by account number and PIN(password), (See at least Page 4, Paragraph 0050+)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Blagg's method of creating linked accounts as taught by Dilip's method/apparatus for implementing financial transaction to allow user to enter the account number and password to access the account. This would greatly increase the security of the system.

As per Claim 11:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein for the primary account and one or more linked secondary accounts managed by the said linked account translator, (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)*

However, Blagg specifically does not teach the following limitation. But Dilip also discloses the following limitations:

- *when the primary account holder processes inquiry and transaction on the said primary account by account number and PIN(password), the linked secondary accounts are linked together and simultaneously for inquiry and transaction in real time. (See at least Page 4, Paragraph 0050+)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Blagg's method of creating linked accounts as taught by Dilip's method/apparatus for implementing financial transaction to allow user to enter the account number and password to access multiple accounts. This would greatly increase the security of the system.

As per Claim 12:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein for the said primary account and one or more linked secondary accounts managed by above linked account translator, (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)*

However, Blagg specifically does not teach the following limitation. But Dilip also discloses the following limitations:

- *when the primary account holder processes inquiry and transaction on the primary account by account number and PIN(password), it is enabled for the primary account holder to process each individual linked secondary accounts with each respective account number **and/or** the name titled by the primary account holder.* (See at least Page 4, Paragraph 0050+)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Blagg's method of creating linked accounts as taught by Dilip's method/apparatus for implementing financial transaction to allow user to enter the account number and password to access multiple accounts. This would greatly increase the security of the system.

As per Claim 13:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein for the primary account and one or more linked secondary accounts managed by the said linked account translator,* (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)

However, Blagg specifically does not teach the following limitation. But Dilip discloses the following limitations:

- *when the primary account holder processes inquiry and transaction on the primary account by account number and PIN(password), rest of the linked accounts are linked together and simultaneously in real time.* (See at least Page 4, Paragraph 0050+)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Blagg's method of creating linked accounts as taught by Dilip's method/apparatus for implementing financial transaction to allow user to enter

the account number and password to access multiple accounts. This would greatly increase the security of the system.

As per Claim 14:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

Furthermore, Blagg also discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein one of the holder's account managed by the said linked account translator is the other person's account, (See at least Page 5, Paragraph 0059+)*
;(Also see at least Page 1, Paragraph 0011+)
- *and the respective the other person's account can be selectively limited to inquiry and transaction only on the said person's account and not on the primary account nor other linked secondary accounts. (See at least Page 1, Paragraph 0012+)*

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Blagg/ Dilip in further view of Walker et al. (hereinafter "Walker1"); (US 5,999,596).

As per Claim 2:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above.

However, Blagg/Dilip does not teach the following limitation. But, Walker1 teaches the following limitations:

- *DTMF measures at terminal connected via internet server or wire & wireless telephone to create transaction data; (See at least Column 5, Line 53+)*
- *ARS server transmitting the said transaction data to the main computer system via external network connection hub; (See at least Fig 1, Item 30)*
- *ATM terminal as well as a counter terminal. (See at least Column 12, Line 6+)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Blagg / Dilip's system as taught by Walker1's

authorizing system to include the DTMF measures at terminal, ARS server, and ATM terminal to be used as an external transaction equipments. As in Walker1, it is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art to attach and install DTMF measures at terminal, ARS server, and ATM terminal to Blagg/Dilip's accounts linking system to effectively communicate with the external equipments.

12. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Blagg/ Dilip in further view of Walker et al. (hereinafter "Walker2"); (US 6,330,544 B1).

As per Claim 8:

Combination of Blagg / Dilip discloses the limitations as shown in the rejections above. However, Blagg/Dilip does not teach the following limitation. But, Walker2 teaches the following limitations:

- *wherein the accounts of the primary account and one or more linked secondary account managed by above linked account translator, for the complete account numbers expressed in L digit by N-number system, allocate a section of M digits in the L digit account number wherein M is smaller number than L, allocate one of the said numbered accounts to the primary account, and allocate least one of the rest numbered accounts to account of another person which the primary account holder appoints; among the account number groups expressed in N digits smaller than L, allocate rest of the account numbers as number for the linked secondary accounts, excluding the said two accounts, those are the said primary account and the said another person's account appointed by the said primary account holder. (See at least Column 12, Line 37+)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Blagg / Dilip's system as taught by Walker2's processing credit card system since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same

function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Edward Chang** whose telephone number is **571.270.3092**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **Kambiz Abdi** can be reached at **571.272.6702**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [<http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>](http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair). Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window**:

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

July 14, 2008
/Edward Chang/ Examiner, Art Unit 3692

/Harish T Dass/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692